

REMARKS**Information Disclosure Statement**

The information disclosure statement being submitted concurrently with this response is believed to address the various objections raised by the Examiner.

§ 102 Rejections

8. **Claims 1-7, 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Slaughter, Jr. (US 5,462,702).**

11. **Claims 1-2 and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Armstrong et al. (US 4,233,396).**

13. **Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kreuz et al. (NPL: Polyimide Films...).**

The Applicant has cancelled claims 14-15 and amended claim 1 to include the limitations of dependent claim 16. These 35 U.S.C. 102 rejections are moot in view of such amendments.

§ 103 Rejections

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of dependent claim 16. Of the various rejections categorized by the Examiner as rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103, (beginning on p. 5 of the Office Action of September 24, 2010), the only rejection pertaining to dependent claim 16 is as follows:

31. **Claims 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a and e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Yokoyama et al. (WO 2004/010452).**

The Examiner alleged that “the mold (of WO 2004/010452) comprised of a polymeric material (PET) is capable of having a coefficient of hygroscopic swelling per percent relative humidity in claimed range.”

The Applicant submits that WO 2004/010452 describes “A flexible mold comprising a **support** made of a material having a tensile strength of at least 5 kg/mm² and **containing moisture to saturation** at a temperature and a relative humidity **at the time of use by moisture treatment applied in advance** . . . (See Abstract of WO 2004/010452)

Hence, WO 2004/010452 concerns *reducing the dimensional change* of the flexible mold *by altering the moisture content of the support* as a function of temperature and relative humidity.

In contract, the present invention concerns *reducing the dimensional change* of the flexible mold *by altering the composition of the support* by inclusion of “20 to 70 percent volume of a reinforcing material blended with the polymeric material”.

Note that the support material utilized in WO 2004/010452, a PET film having a thickness of 188 µm (See p. 18 of WO 2004/010452) is comparable to the support material described in Comparative Example 5, at p. 24 of the present patent application. Note that the hygroscopic swelling of Comparative Example 5 was 8 ppm/%RH. Hence, Comparative Example 5 supports that the polymeric support material (PET) of WO 2004/010452 does NOT have a coefficient of hygroscopic swelling per percent relative humidity of less than 5 ppm, as presently claimed.

A timely allowance is respectfully request.

Respectfully submitted,

November 1, 2010

Date

By: _____/Carolyn A. Fischer/

Carolyn A. Fischer, Reg. No.: 39,091

Telephone No.: 651-575-3915

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833